

### REMARKS

The Office Action mailed December 22, 2006 considered claims 1-28, 42-46, 48-56, 59 and 60. Claims 1-4, 8-13, 16, 17, 19-24, 26, 27, 46, 48, 49 and 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Freund et al.* (US 2003/0167405) hereinafter *Freund* and further in view of *Tate et al.* (US 6,493,751) hereinafter *Tate*. Claims 5-7, 14, 15, 18, 25, 28, 54 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Freund* in view of *Tate* and further in view of *Lipe et al.* (US 5,748,980) hereinafter *Lipe*. Claims 42-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Freund* in view of *I'Anson et al.* (US 6,760,046) hereinafter *I'Anson*. Claims 45, 52 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Freund* in view of *Tate* and further in view of *Phillips* (US 6,748,195) hereinafter *Phillips*. Claims 50 and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Freund* in view of *Tate* and further in view of *Akiyama et al.* (US 6,757,821) hereinafter *Akiyama*. Claims 56 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Freund* in view of *Tate* and further in view of *Korpi et al.* (US 6,198,696) hereinafter *Korpi*. Claims 60 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Freund* in view of *Tate* and further in view of *I'Anson*.<sup>1</sup>

By this paper, claim 11 has been amended to correct an obvious typographical error, and new claim 61 has been added, such that claims 1-28, 42-46, 48-56, 59 and 61 remain pending in the application.

For the sake of clarity and to more quickly focus on the pertinent issues in this response, Applicants do not provide a summary and background of the invention as now presented, but

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

rather refer the Examiner to the previous response "Amendment D" filed on September 28 at page 12 which includes such a summary.

As indicated in applicant's communication to the Examiner on February 20 and February 22, the art cited in the office action simply does not teach or suggest what is recited by the claims of the present application. For example, claim 1 recites **"wherein modifying the configuration of the computer system includes changing one or more country dependent software settings including one or more of a default language setting and a currency symbol setting."**

To show this element, the office action cites to Tate at col. 13, line 67 – col. 14, line 20. The cited portion of Tate discloses determining a country and determining corresponding global modem-capable modem commands to make a modem electrically compatible with a particular communication network. Tate is completely devoid of any reference to changing default language or currency symbol settings. Rather, Tate focuses strictly on sending one or more modem commands for modem compatibility. The Examiner's attention is further directed to new claim 61, which limits the country dependent software settings to currency symbol settings.

Similarly, claim 42 recites **"wherein modifying the configuration of the computer system includes changing a favorites list from one appropriate for a first network environment to one appropriate for a different second network environment."**

To show this limitation, the office action cites to I'Anson, col. 9, lines 29-38. However, this portion of I'Anson shows a home version of a home page and an away version of a home page. However, I'Anson does not show different versions of a favorites list as is recited by the claims of the present application.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will

be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at 801-533-9800.

Dated this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of March, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER  
Registration No. 28,651  
J. LAVAR OLDHAM  
Registration No. 53,409  
Attorney for Applicant  
Customer No. 47973